

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed February 23, 2007.

The Examiner has indicated that the claims do not recite statutory subject matter, since they do not “convey the result of the located data to the user.” Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite an addition step of “conveying a result of the located data to a user” as suggested by the Examiner.

The sole prior art based rejection is an anticipation rejection over Crandall, U.S. Patent No. 6,321,228. The difference between Crandall and what is claimed is quite striking and, therefore, not much discussion is required to address the rejection.

In particular, as is set forth in great detail in the specification, the subject matter of the claims deals with meanings of terms and the context in which such terms appear. Thus, for example, Crandall may refer to and be concerned with the processing of absolute search terms such as "orange OR apple OR melon" against specific data in a database.

By contrast, the claims refer to the meaning and context of the search term and the meaning of the data. Using the previous example, "orange OR apple OR melon" may match data containing the terms "nectarine", "granny smith", "cantaloupe" but would not probably not match "goldfish" because it is not an edible fruit (even though it is orange in color). The Crandall patent would fail to match any of these terms because it does not take context or meaning into account.

Referring to Applicant's claim 1, it can be seen that a step of the recited method includes:

locating the portions of the electronic data based on the determined meaning and in accordance with a context ascribed to the determined meaning with reference to meanings associated with previous result data, located in response to previous search queries.

Crandall's Fig. 5, cited by the Examiner, explicitly illustrates matching phrases (phrase match query 504), all words (all-word query 506) or any word (any-word query 508). There is nothing that discloses, or even suggests, considering either meaning or context, let alone both meaning and context.

For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 (and claims 2-13, dependent on claim 1) are patentable over Crandall.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/ASH/
Alan S. Hodes
Reg. No. 38,185

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
408-255-8001